

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
May 3, 2017**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 PM, in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Chairman Guarino, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

**PRESENT: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia,**  
**Absent: Benavides, Cone, Grube, Brittain**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
  - Preservation Month in San Antonio - May 2017
  - Amazing Preservation Race - La Villita - May 6 - 9AM
  - Power of Preservation and OHP Mini Golf Extravaganza - May 12 - 6PM
  - Rehabarama! - 100 and 200 block of Harding Place, Pittman-Sullivan Park - May 13 - 8AM
  - Archaeological Discovery: Powder House - Central Library - May 15 - 6PM
  - Spirit of Sarah King: Festival of the Arts - Sarah S King Elementary School - May 18 - 5PM
  - Amazing Preservation Race for Kids - San Antonio Zoo - May 20 - 8AM
  - Mission Possible: World Heritage Bus Tour
  - New Frontiers Charter School Festival of the Arts - May 25 - 5PM

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Liz Franklin spoke in support on general items related to Dignowity Hill Cases.  
Nettie Hinton spoke about the Hays St. Bridge

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-188 | 116,122,124,126,128 and 132 E HOUSTON ST                     |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-127 | 206 ADAMS ST   |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-157 | 1017 HAYS ST   |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-187 | 417 N OLIVE ST   |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-191 | 830 NOLAN  |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-206 | <del>301 W HOLLYWOOD AVE</del> <b>WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT</b> |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-193 | 1810 E PYRON AVE   |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-196 | 416 LAMAR ST   |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-203 | 2119 N IH 35   |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-200 | 607 E MISTLETOE  |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-204 | 1935 W WOODLAWN  |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-210 | 610 N MAIN (FORMERLY 615 SOLEDAD)                            |

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve the Consent Agenda with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**13. HDRC NO. 2017-212**

Applicant: Sal Flores/Bendicion Engineering, LLC

Address: 823 OGDEN ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Zoning Commission to remove historic designation from the property at 823 Ogden.

May 3, 2017

**FINDINGS:**

a. The property in consideration, located at the parcel 823 Ogden, is a vacant lot that was recently divided from an adjacent corner lot with the same associated parcel address. The structure located at the corner of 823 Ogden is an individually designated historic landmark and is owned by a different owner than the applicant. The applicant is the property owner of the vacant lot. The applicant is requesting the removal of historic designation from the vacant lot previously conjoined with the landmark structure at 823 Ogden.

b. LOT DIVISION – The parcel associated with the address 823 Ogden has been divided into two lots for some time. The lots are presently owned by two separate owners. According to deed research from BCAD provided by the applicant, a deed was granted for the vacant lot from the owner of the entire parcel to a new grantee on May 8, 2013. The parcel as a whole carried the H overlay associated with the individual landmark structure at the address 823 Ogden prior to the division. The lot containing the historic structure will continue to carry the H overlay.

c. HISTORIC LANDMARK – The historic landmark located at 823 Ogden was individually designated on August 4, 2011. The property was identified as an eligible historic landmark by Office of Historic Preservation Staff on May 11, 2010 after the property was identified by Code Compliance for repair on April 16, 2010. The structure is a 2-story single-family home constructed in 1906 in the Queen Anne style. The criteria met for the landmark designation per UDC Sec. 35-607(b) included: the embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, or method of construction [35-607(b)(5)]; the unique location or singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature, primarily its corner location at Ogden and Dewey in the Tobin Hill neighborhood [35-607(b)(7)]; and its historical, architectural, or cultural integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship [35-607(b)(8)]. The designation included the entire parcel then associated with the 823 Ogden address, which has historically encapsulated both lots, as evidenced by Sanborn Maps drawn in 1912 and 1951.

d. DEVELOPMENTAL PATTERN – The area surrounding 823 Ogden was originally a premier residential San neighborhood on the fringe of downtown San Antonio. Historically, residential lot patterns within the vicinity featured deep rectangular lots with front setbacks varying from approximately 15 to 25 feet. As evidenced in a 1912 Sanborn Map, it was not uncommon for a residential property to contain the area of two full standard-sized rectangular lots within one parcel. These double-sized lots were primarily concentrated on corner lots and featured a singular dwelling with a smaller accessory structure on the rear property line. 823 Ogden was one of the prominent corner lots that followed this development pattern. The context of the block has changed significantly over the past 50 years and features a mixture of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed use, and large-scale commercial and retail structures. The entire parcel of 823 Ogden is one of the last remaining properties in the vicinity that retains a high degree of integrity of location in terms of both its historic structure and its historic platting.

e. DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY – The vacant lot is located within an identified eligible historic district. The eligible district is roughly bordered to the north by the Monte Vista Historic District and to the east by the Tobin Hill Historic District. 823 Ogden is located a block and a half west of the Tobin Hill Historic District boundary. In 2004, during a survey effort for the Tobin Hill neighborhood, meeting minutes indicate that the area immediately surrounding 823 Ogden contained several “heritage buildings” or potential individual landmarks, but was not considered for inclusion in the Tobin Hill Historic District due to a lack of concentration of historic buildings and a high degree of modern infill development relative to the character and continuity of the Tobin Hill Historic District, primarily due to the commercial artery of McCullough Ave. Though the block has changed significantly as indicated in finding d and is surrounded by commercial arteries, several other nearby streets, including Ogden St, Locust St, Myrtle St, and Dewey Pl, contain a concentration of structures that are eligible as contributing to a potential historic district independent of those already established.

f. REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION – Consistent with the UDC Sec. 35- 606(g), designation may be considered for removal if the applicant presents new and compelling evidence that the property no longer meets the criteria for landmark designation. It is important to retain historic designation in almost all cases unless there is new evidence that shows that the designation and the protections offered by the H overlay are no longer necessary to preserve historic resources. In effect, a historic landmark and its siting functions as a historic district with its own character defining features, of which landscape, lot sizing, setbacks, and developmental pattern are a consideration. In this case, the historic structure originally identified in the landmark designation approved in 2011 included the entirety of the parcel at the time. Two of its cited criteria for landmark designation include elements of its siting in addition to its structural integrity: 1. The unique location or singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature, primarily its corner location, and 2. Its historical, architectural, or cultural integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship. These criteria have not changed since the landmark’s designation, and its integrity of location, visual prominence, and siting is still high. The visual prominence of this landmark is emphasized by its historic siting, setback, and double-sized lot. Subdividing a lot does not introduce a visual change to the existing integrity of the original parcel. Staff does not believe new or compelling evidence has been presented and does not believe the criteria for the removal of designation per UDC Sec. 35-606(g) has been met.

May 3, 2017

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of historic designation based on findings a through f.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

- The request for a zoning change from MF-33 to IDZ HL was postponed by the Zoning Commission on April 18, 2017.
- The retention of an H zoning overlay does not prohibit a change in the base zoning.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to move for denial of the applicant's request

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**14. HDRC NO. 2017-181**

Applicant: Ricardo McCullough/McCullough Design Associates

Address: 330 E MYRTLE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a two story addition in the rear of the property, to include modifications to the existing roofline.
2. Replace existing shingle roof with new metal roof.
3. Remove existing facade elements, including windows and siding, from the primary structure for addition.
4. Remove an existing chimney.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 330 E. Myrtle St is a single-family home with Craftsman details. The home features a deep, lowpitched double gable roofline and exposed rafter beams. The property is a contributing structure in the Tobin Hill Historic District. The applicant has proposed to construct a new addition to the rear of the property, remove an existing chimney, modify existing fenestration, and replace the existing shingle roof with a new standing seam metal roof.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 11, 2017 and April 26, 2017. On April 11, the DRC recommended the retention of the existing chimney, installing windows on either side of the chimney to allow for light into the new bedroom, shifting a new window on the west façade slightly to align with the historic fenestration, modifying dormer roofs on the sides of the new addition to shed roofs, and the submission of a window schedule showing where new and salvaged windows would be located. The applicant was heard by the HDRC on April 19, 2017 and it was referred back to DRC based on unresolved final solutions for the roofline, chimney, and windows. At the DRC on April 26, the committee members echoed the earlier suggestion to retain the chimney and, if deteriorated beyond repair, to rebuild the chimney in-kind on the exterior, noting that the chimney is a character defining feature of the home. The applicant also inset the addition slightly from the primary structure in new drawings, and the DRC commended this approach. The DRC also repeated the need for a window schedule showing the locations of the new and salvaged windows. The DRC suggested adjusting the rear addition's roofline to a steeper pitch and deeper eaves to reflect the existing roofline on the primary structure that will be removed to make way for the addition. This intent is illustrated in sketches made to the originally submitted drawings included in the exhibits. Staff agreed that this updated solution complies with the guidelines as described in finding f. Final documents showing this updated approach have yet to be submitted by the applicant at the time of posting.

c. FOOTPRINT - The proposed addition is located at the rear of the structure and is less than a third of the existing footprint in size. The block also features historic homes with much larger footprints extending deep into lots. Staff finds the additional footprint consistent with guideline 1.B.iv and compatible with the lot size, existing setbacks, and neighborhood context.

d. HEIGHT - The guidelines stipulate that an addition should be consistent with the height existing structure as to not overwhelm or distract from the primary form. The proposed rear addition matches the height of the original structure and does not overwhelm the primary façade. Additionally, the home is neighbored on the west, north, and south by two-story structures, which are common in the neighborhood and the district as a whole. Staff finds the height of the proposed addition acceptable and consistent with the guidelines.

May 3, 2017

e. **MATERIALITY** - Guideline 3.A.i states that additions should include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. The applicant has proposed to offset the addition by approximately 1 foot to provide a clear indication of where the primary structure ends and the addition begins. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

f. **ROOF DESIGN** - The proposed addition's roof will match the height of the existing ridgeline and extend into the rear of the lot. Currently, the lot on the east side of the house is vacant, and its east façade is directly visible from the public right-of-way. The proposed roof features details that break the plane of a continuous roof form, including side dormers with simple shed roofs reflective of the existing structure's primary roof configuration, and a steeper roof pitch with extended rafters at the rear 1/3 of the addition that directly echoes the existing roof form to be removed to make way for the addition. The extension reflects the historic roof pitch while adding dimension and depth to the side elevations as to not overwhelm the primary structure on the east façade. Staff does find the roof form compatible with the existing structure in its architectural gestures and consistent with the guidelines.

g. **ROOF MATERIAL** – The checklist for metal roofs in the Historic Design Guidelines do not recommend replacing an existing non-metal roof with metal unless metal roofs were common for the construction style and era. Metal roofs are historically common on Craftsman homes and are highly characteristic of homes along this particular corridor of E. Myrtle St. Staff finds the proposal consistent with these guidelines given the style of the home and the material context of the surrounding district.

h. **CHIMNEY REMOVAL** – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic masonry should be preserved or replaced with in-kind material whenever possible. Staff does not find the proposed removal of the chimney consistent with the guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Staff recommends approval of the two story addition based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits a set of elevation drawings indicating the final roof form for staff approval.
  - ii. That the applicant submits a window schedule indicating where existing windows will be removed, where existing windows will be relocated, and where new windows will be installed in both the existing structure and new addition.
  - iii. That the applicant submits details on the new window specifications, profile, and inset on the structure.
2. Staff recommends approval of the roof replacement based on findings a and f with the stipulation that the metal roof comply with the OHP Checklist for Metal Roofs.
3. Staff recommends approval of the fenestration modifications with stipulation ii indicated in recommendation #1.
4. Staff does not recommend the removal of the existing chimney. If the existing chimney is not repairable, staff recommends that the chimney be reconstructed in-kind. The applicant must submit visual documentation of the existing chimney, including dimensions, to staff with a plan for reconstruction for approval.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 11, 2017. The case was heard by the HDRC on April 19, 2017 and was referred back to DRC. The applicant attended DRC again on April 26, 2017. Items discussed are included in finding b.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia approve with staff recommendations and stipulations

**AYES:** Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia

**NAYS**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2017-209**

Applicant: Aline Yoldi/Pfluger Architects

Address: 202 CONNELLY ST/1602 DAKOTA ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Add painted lettering on the front (west) elevation of the structure to reflect the future use of the property.
2. Add 1'-0" tall metal letters on the new addition (east elevation).

May 3, 2017

**FINDINGS:**

a. The property located at 202 Connelly St/1602 Dakota St is a two-story structure designed in the Greek Revival style. The building, constructed in 1915, was originally one story and functioned as the Corinth Baptist Church. It was converted into the Good Samaritan Hospital in the late 1940s to serve black patients during the era of racial segregation, at which point a second story was added by builder W.C. White. The building served as a hospital for approximately ten years. After the Civil Rights movement, the building was used as a women's dormitory for St. Phillip's College, and later was used as an administration building for various nonprofits. The applicant received HDRC approval in 2012 to begin a major restoration of the structure, which will serve as the Good Samaritan Veteran's Outreach & Transition Center upon completion. The applicant is proposing to modify existing painted signage, as well as add new metal letters on the east façade, to reflect the new use of the structure.

b. **CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE** – The painted signage on the west façade of the structure had, over time, become a visible and tangible remnant of the building's historic function. This remnant was key to the social identity and public memory of the historic significance of the structure. The building's landmark designation was directly reflective of its use as a hospital for underserved black community members during the period of legalized racial segregation in America, which was indicated through the painted signage. In an HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness issued on November 7, 2012, staff recommendation included that the "ghost signage and wood pilasters are visible and present and should be repaired or replicated in kind to the extent possible." The stipulations did not include the requirement to retain the ghost lettering as existing.

c. **PAINTED LETTERING** – The painted lettering originally read "Good Samaritan Hospital" on either side of the entry pediment, reflective of its second use as a hospital. The applicant is proposing to paint "Good Samaritan Veteran's" on the left side of the pediment and "Outreach & Transition Center" on the right side of the pediment to accurately reflect the future use of the property. The proposal includes a font similar to all-caps Arial and will use a two-tone painted approach with black text and a red outline to match the original lettering style. According to Preservation Brief 25 provided by the National Park Service, historic signs should not be recreated or overrestored, as the evidence of their age is a key contributor to their design. The brief also states that modifying a historic sign can be done for new businesses by modifying details. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

d. **METAL LETTERING** – The applicant has proposed to install 1'-0" tall metal letters reading "Good Samaritan Veteran's Outreach & Transition Center" on the east façade of the building, which will be an addition. The letters will be in Times New Roman font. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Signage, the aggregate area of wall mounted signs should be limited to twenty-five percent of a building's façade. Additionally, guideline 3.C.ii stipulates that wall mounted signage should not project more than twelve inches from the building wall. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff recommends approval of the new painted lettering based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant submit final drawings to staff for approval. The drawings should indicate height, location, and paint colors of the lettering.

2. Staff recommends approval of the new metal lettering installation based on findings a and d with the stipulation that the applicant submit final drawings to staff for approval. The final drawings should indicate how far the metal lettering will project from the façade.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

The applicant received HDRC approval in 2012 to conduct a major restoration of the structure, which will serve as the Good Samaritan Veteran's Outreach and Transition Center. The project includes an addition and full scale exterior and interior work as indicated in the exhibits.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2017-201**

Applicant: Jennifer Garcia/Liberty Signs, Inc

Address: 3006 BROADWAY

May 3, 2017

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install one wall mounted, LED illuminated channel letter sign to read "Sprint" to feature 10' – 2 9/16" in length and 3'-0" in height to feature approximately thirty (30) square feet on the west facing facade. The proposed sign is to also feature the Sprint logo.
2. Install one wall mounted, LED illuminated channel letter sign to read "Sprint" to feature 10' – 2 9/16" in length and 3'-0" in height to feature approximately thirty (30) square feet on the north facing facade. The proposed sign is to also feature the Sprint logo.
3. Install one, double sided face on a previously approved monument sign to be 3' – 11" in width and 1' – 11" in Height

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to install four signs for a tenant retail space at the new construction at 3006 Broadway. At the June 15, 2016, Historic and Design Review Commission, the HDRC approved a master signage plan which approved the size and placement of signage, which included wall signage totaling twenty (20) square feet for each tenant space fronting Broadway and ten (10) square feet of signage for the corner tenant space at the corner of Broadway and E Mulberry. In addition to building signage, the HDRC also approved a monument sign. Since that time, wall signage for tenant spaces have been installed that are consistent with master signage plan.

b. MONUMENT FACE – The applicant has proposed to install a sign face on each side of the existing monument sign. The proposed faces are to be routed aluminum panels with white lexan letters that are to include the Sprint logo. The proposed faces will be consistent with the previously approved monument sign's specifications and the previously approved master signage plan.

c. FRONT SIGN – On the west facing facade, front Broadway, the applicant has proposed to install an LED illuminated, channel letter sign to read "Sprint" to feature 10' – 2 9/16" in length and 3'-0" in height to feature approximately thirty (30) square feet on the west facing facade. The proposed sign is to also feature the Sprint logo. Staff finds that this sign is sized inappropriately sized in accordance to the previously approved master signage plan. Staff finds that the proposed signage should be reduced to no more than twenty (20) square feet.

d. SIDE SIGN – On the north facing facade, the applicant has proposed to install an LED illuminated, channel letter sign to read "Sprint" to feature 10' – 2 9/16" in length and 3'-0" in height to feature approximately thirty (30) square feet on the west facing facade. The proposed sign is to also feature the Sprint logo. Staff finds the proposed signage at this location, facing an interior parking lot, is inappropriate. Additionally, signage was neither originally proposed nor approved at this location in the master signage plan.

e. EXISTING PYLON – Immediately at the corner of Broadway and E Mulberry, an existing pylon from the previous Jack in the Box pole sign remains. Staff finds that the pylon should be removed given that pole signs are prohibited in the River Improvement Overlay.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #3 based on findings b and c with the stipulation that the applicant reduce the size of the front (Broadway) facing sign to no more than twenty (20) square feet and that the existing pylon should be removed.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 based on finding d.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve as submitted

**AYES:** Guarino, Conner, Garza, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia

**NAYS:** Lazarine

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2017-197**

Applicant: Lauren Bartholomew

Address: 416 LAMAR ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install solar panels on the primary structure at

May 3, 2017

416 Lamar. The applicant has proposed to locate the panels as following:

1. Locate six panels on the southern (rear) roof slope of the primary historic structure.
2. Locate six panels on the western roof slope of the rear carport.
3. Locate twelve panels on the western roof slope of the primary historic structure.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to install a total of twenty-four solar panels on the roofs of both the primary and rear accessory structure at 416 Lamar. The historic structure was constructed circa 1920 and features craftsman style architectural elements.

b. On the southern (rear) roof slope of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to locate six solar panels as well as mount six additional solar panels on the west facing roof slope of the rear carport. The Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i. notes that solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to minimize visibility from the public right of way while maximizing solar access. Alternatively, solar collectors can be mounted on a garage or outbuilding. The proposed locations are consistent with the Guidelines.

c. On the west facing roof slope of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to locate twelve solar panels. Per the applicant's application documents, the proposed solar panels are to be located near the front façade of the primary historic structure. The Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii. should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to minimize visibility from the public right of way while maximizing solar access. Staff finds that the proposed panels should be located to the rear of the side roof slope to be consistent with the Guidelines.

d. Per the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii., collectors are to be mounted flush to the roof and feature a similar color to that of the roof surface to reduce visibility.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on finding b with the stipulation that the proposed panels be mounted flush to the roof slopes.

Staff recommends approval of item #3 based on finding c with the stipulation that the proposed panels be shifted to the rear of the west facing roof slope.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Liz Franklin spoke in support of the applicant's request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted

**AYES:** Guarino, Garza, Garcia Conner

**NAYS:** Kamal, Laffoon

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**18. HDRC NO. 2017-202**

Applicant: Richard Gross

Address: 503 NOLAN, 507 NOLAN

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a deck between 503 and 507 Nolan and a deck to surround both structures.
2. Perform exterior modifications to 503 Nolan that include the removal of window and door openings and fenestration alterations.
3. Perform exterior modifications to 507 Nolan that include the removal of window and door openings and fenestration modifications.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 503 Nolan was constructed circa 1955 and features simple architectural elements including a front and rear gabled roof. The structure at 507 Nolan appears on the 1951 Sanborn map and features side gabled roofs and traditional architectural features.

b. DECKS – Between both structures, the applicant has proposed to construct a wooden deck. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to construct a wooden deck to surround both structures. The Guidelines for Exterior

May 3, 2017

Maintenance and Alterations note that porches should be constructed based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District, historic porches are featured on the front and side of historic structures; however, there is no historic example for the construction of a deck to surround a historic structure nor is there a historic example of the connection of two separate historic structures. Staff does not find the proposed decks appropriate nor are they consistent with the Guidelines.

c. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed exterior modifications to the structure at 503 Nolan that includes the removal of a front façade window, the relocation of an existing rear door, the removal of 4 windows on the left elevation and the installation of seven (7) new windows openings and the removal of five (5) windows on the right side of the house and the installation of three (3) new window openings and a sliding glass door. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window and door openings should be preserved. Additionally, historic window and door openings should not be enclosed. The applicant's proposed modifications are not consistent with the Guidelines.

d. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed exterior modifications to the structure at 507 Nolan that includes the removal of a window and side door on the front façade, the removal of three (3) windows and one (1) door on the rear façade of the house and the installation of one (1) window and two (2) sliding glass doors, the removal of five (5) windows on the right side of the house with the installation of (1) one window and the replacement of three windows with three (3) new windows at different locations. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window and door openings should be preserved. Additionally, historic window and door openings should not be enclosed. The applicant's proposed modifications are not consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings b through d.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to remain this case to the DRC.

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**19. HDRC NO. 2017-192**

Applicant: Richard Gross

Address: 1025 DAWSON ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Modify existing window and door opening on the rear façade and install a new, sliding glass door.
2. Replace wood windows that are beyond repair with new non-wood windows.
3. Enclose an existing window opening on the rear of the side addition with siding.
4. Enclose an existing window opening on the side (east) of the side addition with siding.
5. Modify an existing door opening to become a window opening on the east elevation near the rear of the structure. Siding will be installed in the enclosed opening.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 1025 Dawson was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps. The structure was constructed in the Craftsman style and has since been modified to include a side addition near its front façade and a modified front façade which includes a modified front porch, replacement wrought iron porch columns and a brick façade. The side addition as well as rear additions appear on the 1951 Sanborn map. The exhibits currently show a rear addition that is not proposed by the applicant at this time. Additionally, the applicant has not submitted a detail or wall section of the proposed doors or windows at this time.

b. REAR FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS– On the rear façade, the applicant has proposed to modify an existing door and window opening. The proposed modification is to occur on the rear façade of the original structure. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.1., historic window and door openings are to be preserved and should not be enlarged or diminished. The proposed modifications are not consistent with the Guidelines.

c. SIDE ADDITION MODIFICATIONS– The applicant has proposed to enclose two existing openings on the side



May 3, 2017

addition, one which faces the east and one which faces the north. The existing side addition features a roof slope that is not consistent with the original structure and also features materials that are not consistent with those found predominantly on the original structure. Modifications to the original structure including front porch modifications contain materials commonly used during the 1950's.

d. **SIDE ADDITION MODIFICATIONS** – Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.1., historic window and door openings are to be preserved. Staff finds the removal of the rear facing window appropriate given its location on a rear facing façade; however, staff finds that the existing side window is to remain. Structures located within historic districts typically do not feature entire wall planes that lack fenestration.

e. **REAR ADDITION MODIFICATIONS** – The rear of the primary historic structure features an addition with a side (east) facing door. The applicant has proposed to remove this door and install a window in its place that is to match the existing wood windows in the addition in regards to size and profile. Staff finds the proposed modification appropriate given that the addition is not original to the historic structure given its location at the rear of the primary historic structure and its differing roof form. Additionally, this addition is not found on the 1912 or 1951 Sanborn maps. The applicant should install a window that features a matching profile to that of the rear addition as well as one that is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document that is to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details. If the windows that will be removed from the side addition are matching in size as those on the rear addition, they should be installed in place of the existing door.

f. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has noted the replacement of the existing windows with new, same size and type modern windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that historic windows should be preserved. Staff finds the windows on site to be in good condition and should be repaired.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings b and e. Staff recommends the applicant maintain the rear façade arrangement and repair the existing windows.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4 based on finding d.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #5 based on findings c and d.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to remained to the DRC

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2017-194**

Applicant: Cagney Rogers/Cagney Rogers Roofing Professionals

Address: 128 W MAGNOLIA AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing flat tile roof and install a new standing seam metal roof on the primary structure.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure located at 128 W Magnolia is an apartment complex with a symmetrical H-plan constructed in 1926 in the Colonial Revival style by builder W. N. Nagy. It features key Colonial Revival characteristics, including a front entrance accentuated by simplified columns, triple windows, and distinctive keystones above each window on center. The complex is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a metal standing seam roof.

b. The existing roof features six low-pitched hipped gables, two distinct symmetrical axes, and a minimal eave overhang. It is made of scalloped tile shingles with accentuated barrel tile ridge lines. Scalloped shingles, and shingle roofs in general, are a character defining feature of Colonial Revival buildings. Additionally, the use of tiles, particularly barrel mission tiles on the ridge lines, is a unique feature of this structure, as it evokes a common Spanish Eclectic characteristic that suggests a blend of two styles common in both the district and period of

May 3, 2017

construction in San Antonio. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, when roof replacement is required, replacement should utilize in-kind materials. Additionally, the guidelines stipulate that metal roofs may be installed if there is historic proof that a metal roof was used on the original structure, or if metal roofs are characteristic of the building's style. There is no evidence that a metal roof originally existed on this complex and metal roofs are not characteristic of Colonial Revival structures. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the roof replacement based on findings a and b. Staff recommends that the applicant meet with staff to determine the best available replacement materials.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve composite asphalt tile in diamond, pattern with ceramic tile edging as proposed in today's hearing, samples must be submitted to staff for approval.

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2017-207**

Applicant: Tyler Sibley/Pursuant Ventures

Address: 325 W MISTLETOE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Remove and replace an original 6 over 1 window on the primary façade with a new 1 over 1 window.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 325 W Mistletoe a single-family home designed in the Craftsman Bungalow style and is estimated to be constructed between 1930 and 1935. The property appears on a Sanborn map in 1935.

b. WINDOW REMOVAL – The original 6 over 1 window, located directly to the right of the property's main entrance, has been removed and replaced without approval. Administrative approval was granted to repair the original window on August 12, 2016. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved unless deteriorated beyond repair. The proposed removal and reuse of the 6 over 1 window is not appropriate.

c. HISTORIC TAX CREDIT VERIFICATION – The window was previously deemed repairable when approved for Historic Tax Credit Certification on December 7, 2016. The property is currently in violation for requirements for final Historic Tax Credit Verification and is not eligible for the incentive unless the original window or a salvaged 6 over 1 window is returned in place of the new window.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the window removal based on findings a through c.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to postpone this case to the next HDRC meeting due to an absent applicant

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to Adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

May 3, 2017

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Kamal to adjourn.

**AYES: Guarino, Conner, Garza, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:48 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair